

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION**



**THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2006
KIVA CONFERENCE ROOM – CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

CALL TO ORDER

The Study Session of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Vice-Chair Davis at 5:25 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Brian Davis, Vice-Chair
William Howard, Commissioner
Matthew Taunton, Commissioner
J. David Hill, Commissioner
Kelly McCall, Commissioner
Andrea Michaels, Commissioner

ABSENT: Mark Gilliland, Chair

STAFF PRESENT: Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Basha, Morrison Maierle

Introduction of New Commissioner, Ms. Andrea Michaels

Ms. Andrea Michaels, the new Commissioner, introduced herself.

1. **REVIEW OF TONIGHT'S REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

• **Neighborhood Traffic Management Policies and Procedures**

Ms. O'Connor noted that the agenda includes approval of the public review draft of the Neighborhood Traffic Management Policies and Procedures. Public outreach will be conducted over the summer and in September. Ms. O'Connor noted that the Department might make interim use of speed humps for traffic calming. Mr. Porell explained that a speed hump is

3 -12 inches high and 12 feet wide with a parabolic shape. The City does not use speed bumps, which are seen on private property such as shopping centers. He added there is an example of a speed hump on 84th Street north of Shea Boulevard.

Ms. O'Connor summarized that staff have condensed a long, prescriptive document with several appendices into a document that allows, but does not require, petitions and allows for a community-working group as an alternative to petitions. In addition, staff attempted to simplify the process for citizens to provide more flexibility with clear criteria.

Commissioner Howard asked Ms. O'Connor about how the previous process worked. She explained the scoring system. Mr. Paul Basha of Morrison Maierle noted there is only one rigid guideline regarding numbers in the new process, whereas the previous policy had a number of different calculations. The new process eliminates the rigidity.

Commissioner Michaels inquired whether there is anything in the Neighborhood Traffic Management Policies and Procedures that consider the long-term effects on citywide transportation of neighborhood traffic calming measures. She noted that issues have arisen in the past. Mr. Basha indicated that on page 4 of the draft, item 17 refers to this matter. The only way a street can be closed is if it does not have a negative impact on the adjacent street. Road closure is the least desirable alternative.

Commissioner Michaels asked what the reference to "planned streets" refers to. Mr. Porell responded that this refers to the Streets Master Plan, which will become part of the Transportation Master Plan. Ms. O'Connor noted that since neighborhood traffic calming measures can affect elements of the Transportation Master Plan, such as vehicular circulation, pedestrian/bicycle accessibility and transit, a reference to the Transportation Master Plan should be inserted. Ms. O'Connor remarked that any measure that does not involve a street closure is relatively easy to modify if necessary.

Commissioner Michaels asked whether the Transportation Master Plan is integrated with other City planning documents. Ms. O'Connor replied it is based on the General Plan, whose goals are broad. She perceives communication to interested citizens as the biggest issue.

Commissioner Michaels asked whether there is a notification process for the entire city so that affected people who do not live in the immediate area can have input. Ms. O'Connor replied that the best method identified so far is to post street signs. The Department is looking at various ways to inform residents and drivers of projects. Projects are also posted on the website. Commissioner Michaels inquired about using the listserv or other mailing methods. Ms. O'Connor opined that using the listserv is probably most cost effective.

Mr. Basha noted it is a question of balance. A frequent complaint about traffic calming is that the process is lengthy and bureaucratic. The more requirements for notification are included, the longer and more costly the process becomes. He opined that posting signage is more cost-effective. In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Michaels, Mr. Basha explained that a decision was taken not to recommend putting notices into the newspaper,.

Commissioner Michaels inquired how the survey is conducted. Mr. Porell gave an overview of that process, explaining that the Department would adjust the sampling program to address the particular issues in any given case.

Vice-Chair Davis asked Ms. O'Connor what action staff is looking for on this matter. She replied that the Commission could direct staff to gather public comments on the policies and procedures.

She outlined the process of public outreach, which would include an open public meeting at the September Commission meeting. The Transportation Commission could adopt the policy and staff would then make a presentation to City Council in the Fall. City Council could give the authority to incorporate the policy as part of the Transportation Master Plan. Ms. O'Connor stated that City Council is not required to adopt the policy, but will likely be interested in doing so. She noted that the cost of neighborhood traffic calming measures is generally small compared to other transportation projects.

Commissioner Michaels asked at what point cost becomes a consideration. Ms. O'Connor replied that City Council has to address the cost. Commissioner Howard asked whether these projects are on the CIP list. Mr. Porell replied that there is a CIP line item budget for neighborhood traffic management, and the Department implements traffic calming projects using a draw order procedure.

Commissioner Michaels asked for the cost of the recent project at 96th Street. Ms. O'Connor replied that this was not a traffic calming project but a street redesign, and confirmed that this project fell within the purview of the Transportation Commission. Transportation staff has regularly provided information on the 96th Street project, including budget and cost data, to the Commission. The budget for the project is \$3.589M. Ms. O'Connor commented that the Commission generally focuses more on project elements and policy issues than on specific project costs. The Commission reviews the project budget, but does not analyze the details. She noted this is a quite complex task for Department staff, who work with the Capital Project Management group who generally manage design and construction of all city projects including transportation projects..

Vice-Chair Davis commented that the Commission relies on cost estimates provided by staff. Ms. O'Connor cited the Indian Bend tunnel proposed by some neighbors as an example of Commission review of proposed policy changes and related costs.

- **Current Transportation Project Update**

Not addressed in the Study Session due to time constraints.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the Study Session of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

***NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on 7/20/06